

21



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,835	03/05/2002	Jean-Pierre Harel	Q68669	4779

7590 06/04/2003

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Suite 800
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PATRICIA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,835

Applicant(s)

HAREL, JEAN-PIERRE

Examiner

Patricia T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3 and 7-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Argintaru et al., U.S. Patent # 4,694,260.

Figs. 3 and 6 of Argintaru et al. discloses a microwave circuit comprising: In Fig. 6, microstrip 31 can be read as a transmission microstrip; microstrips 2, 4, 5 can be read as at least one lateral microstrip wherein microstrip 2 coupled to dielectric resonators R1, R2; dielectric resonators R1, R2 can be read as two dielectric resonators.

Regarding claim 5, in Fig. 3, metal plungers 15, 16 can be read as adjustment elements (see spec. col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 5).

Art Unit: 2817

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yrjola, U.S. Patent # 5,432,489.

Fig. 3B of Yrjola discloses a filter comprising: microstrips 31, 35 can be read as a transmission microstrip; microstrips 33, 37 can be read as at least one lateral microstrip wherein microstrip 33 coupled to dielectric resonators 16, 17; dielectric resonators 16, 17 can be read as two dielectric resonators.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argintaru et al., U.S. Patent # 4,694,260.

Although Argintaru et al. does not mention that the relative permittivity of each resonator is not less than 10 or the lateral microstrip has a length equal to $3/4$, the value of the relative permittivity of each resonator or the length of the microstrip is a design variable and thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to design the relative permittivity of each resonator is not less than 10 or the lateral microstrip has a length equal to $3/4$ in order to meet system requirements and to have an optimum working condition for the circuit since this is a matter of design choice.

*Art Unit: 2817

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patents # 6,359,529 B1 of Tsunoda et al., # 4,583,064 of Makimoto et al., # 6,255,917 B1 of Scott contain some limitations of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1927. The examiner can normally be reached on 6AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (703) 308-1927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-0142 for regular communications and (703) 305-0142 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1927.

PTN
May 30, 2003

**PATRICIA NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Patricia Nguyen